S/N: 09/808,243 Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2004

Remarks

The amendment is made subsequent to two Amendments After Final. In the first Amendment After Final, Applicants amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 22. In response, an Advisory Action was mailed in which the Examiner stated that claim 22 was inadvertently omitted from the final rejection. In response, Applicants submitted a second Amendment After Final in which Applicants reinstated claim 22 and amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 13. In response, the present non-final Office Action was mailed in which claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12, 14, 18-19, 22, 24 and 25 were rejected, claims 5, 8-10, 15-17, 20 and 21 were objected to, and claim 23 was allowed. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 9, 16, and 17 have been amended, claim 8 has been cancelled, and claim 13 has been reinstated to its condition prior to the non-final Office Action. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12, 18-19, 22, 24 and 25 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,541,885 issued to Caudill, Jr. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 5, 8-10, 14-17 and 20-21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten claim 8 in independent form. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 8. As such, independent claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-4, 6-7, 11-12, 18-19, 22, 24 and 25 depend on amended claim 1, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Atty Dkt No. LEAR 0835 PUS (02989)

S/N: 09/808,243

Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2004

Conclusion

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD MUHLBACHER et al.

Matthew M. Mietzel

Reg. No. 46,929

Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 4, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 Fax: 248-358-3351